

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8, 10-14 and 16-51 are currently pending. Claims 3-4, 7, 9 and 15 are cancelled.

According to the Office Action, the Specification is objected to for containing abbreviations or acronyms without explanation, i.e. using Infiniband and RapidIO. Applicants state that both Infiniband and RapidIO are protocols that are similar to Internet Protocol (IP), Ethernet, Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) and Synchronous Optical Network (SONET). As seen by reference to [www.infinibandta.org](http://www.infinibandta.org) and [www.rapidio.org](http://www.rapidio.org), neither Infiniband nor RapidIO are abbreviations or acronyms. Moreover, both Infiniband and RapidIO are known by those of skill in the art to which this application is directed. Accordingly, Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

The reference to a Clos network as a two stage/tier network is also objected to in the Specification. Evidence is offered that Clos networks are at least three stage/tier networks. Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art understands that a Clos network can be understood to be a two stage/tier network when the output side of a three stage/tier Clos network is folded over onto the input side of the Clos network. In other words, a Clos network is a two stage/tier network when one side of a Clos network serves as both the input side and the output side such that one input to a Clos network connects to another input in a Clos network using the principles of readily understood by a Clos network. In view of the foregoing, Applicants request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

Claims 15-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, claims 15, 16, 30 and 43 couple a Clos network, bi-delta and mesh networks between left side switches and right side switches. Claim 15 has been deleted but its references to the networks have been incorporated into claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that one of ordinary skill in the art, and specifically in light of the details provided in the Specification, understands that how Clos network, bi-delta and mesh networks are

configured. Applicants refer to Figures 1-6 and the accompanying text. As seen and described, the left side switches are connected to one another according to a Clos network whereby the input and output sides of the Clos network are the same. In addition, the second stage of the Clos network is coupled to the input side of the bi-delta network. The output side of the bi-delta network is connected to the mesh network on the right side and the right side switches are connected to one another using the mesh network model. In other words, the devices connected to the left side are coupled to one another using the principles of a Clos network; the device connected to the left side are coupled to the devices on the right side using the principles of the bi-delta network and the devices connected to the right side are coupled to one another using the mesh network. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, 30 and 43 are fully supported by the Specification and are understood by those of skill in the art. As claims 17-29 depend on claim 16, claims 31-42 depend on claim 30 and claims 44-51 depend on claim 43, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are supported by the Specification for the reasons given above. Applicants request that the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 10, 11, 13 and 15-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 4, 15, 16, 30 and 43 are rejected because the reference to the Clos network is unclear. Claim 4 and 15 have been deleted, but their references have been incorporated into claim 1. Applicants repeat that one of ordinary skill in the art understands that a Clos network can be considered a two stage/tier network when the input stage and the output stage are the same. Thus, a device connected to the input stage can be coupled to another device coupled to the input stage. With reference to the descriptions provided to in United States Patent No. 4,400,627 to Zola, Grinsec and Clos, it is noted that each of these references as a device connected to the input stage being coupled to a device connected to the output stage and that it is not possible for a device connected to a first switch of the first stage to be coupled to device connected to the second switch of the first stage. By folding the third stage over onto the first stage, devices connected to the first stage can be coupled to other devices connected to the first stage. This is what is understood by one of ordinary skill in the art as a two

stage/tier Clos network. In view of the foregoing and the statements made with respect to the objection to the Specification, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 16, 30 and 43 and the claims that depend on them are definite and distinctly claimed. Applicants request that this rejection under Section 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected as it is directed to “a constant bandwidth mesh network.” Claims 5 and 11 are rejected as they are directed to “rearrangeably non-blocking network.” Claim 6 is rejected as it is directed to “a strictly non-blocking network.” And Claim 13 is rejected as it is directed to “fully non-blocking mesh network.” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art understands that a mesh network can be a constant bandwidth network, that a Clos network can be rearrangeably non-blocking or strictly non-blocking and that a mesh network can be fully non-blocking. These terms describe different configurations and arrangements for the various networks. In view of the foregoing, Applicants request that these rejections under Section 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 16, 30 and 43 are rejected because it is not understood how the mentioned Clos network, bi-delta network and mesh networks are coupled. Claim 15 has been cancelled, but its limitations are incorporated into claim 1. Applicants refer to their arguments and presentation with respect to the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, above. In view of these statements, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 16, 30, and 43 are definite and distinctly claimed. Applicants therefore request that this rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 30-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, it is stated that “computer-readable medium containing computer instructions” is non-statutory. According to the helpful suggestions provided, claims 30-42 have been amended so that they are directed to “computer readable media encoded computer instructions.” In view of this amendment and from the statement that this claim format is statutory, Applicants request that the rejection under Section 101 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,786,912 to Kartapoulos and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over United States Patent No. 4,975,909 to Masson. Claims 4 and 6 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masson in view of United States Patent No. 4,400,627 to Zola. Applicants have amended claim 1 and cancelled claims 3-4, 7 and 9. In particular, Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations found in these cancelled claims and in cancelled claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is directed to a network comprising a plurality of left side switches and a plurality of right side switches, wherein each of the plurality of left side switches are bi-directionally coupled to each of the plurality of right side switches, and wherein each of the plurality of right side switches are bi-directionally coupled to each other directly. In addition, a plurality of left end-node devices coupled to one or more of the plurality left side switches and a plurality of right end-node devices coupled to one or more of the plurality of right side switches. The plurality of left end-node devices communicate with each other across a Clos network, the plurality of left end-node devices communicate with the plurality of right end-node devices across a bi-delta network and the plurality of right end-node devices communicate with each other across a mesh network. Neither Kartapoulos, Masson, nor Zola discloses, teaches or otherwise describes the claimed arrangement of the Clos, bi-delta and mesh networks as required by claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated and is patentable over the cited references. As claims 2, 5, 8 and 11-14 depend upon and include the limitations of claim 1, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated and are patentable over the cited references for the same reasons.. Applicants request that the rejections under Sections 102(b) and 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Serial No. 10/611,782  
Wise et al  
Case No. IS01307MCG

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to  
**50-2117.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Wise, Jeffrey L., et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 37,585  
Telephone: 847-576-4234  
Fax: 847-576-3750